



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

In most instances the exact date is of little consequence, but regarding the beginning of Barrowe's imprisonment a more important problem arises. In the account of his examination immediately consequent upon his arrest written by Barrowe, and published soon after his death, he, or his printer, gave the date of the beginning of his imprisonment as November 19, 1586, and further described it as "this 19th being the Lord's day." That date Dr. Powicke, like Dr. Dexter, accepts. Now, Barrowe's arrest took place on a visit to his imprisoned friend, Greenwood; and though Dr. Dexter, moved by Barrowe's apparent definiteness of date, gave a guarded assent to Dr. Waddington's opinion that Greenwood's arrest took place in the autumn of 1586, the testimony of the State Papers points much more to October 1587 as its true epoch. Barrowe, or his printer, probably made an error in designating the year; and a decided confirmation of this conclusion is to be found in the fact that November 19 fell on Sunday in 1587, not in 1586, a fact which Dr. Dexter and Dr. Powicke have overlooked. If Barrowe's imprisonment really began in November 1587, it makes readily comprehensible his statement, in the spring of 1590, that he had "been two years and well-nigh a half kept by the bishops in close prison," without resorting to conjecture, as Dr. Powicke does, as to a possible mitigation of his imprisonment in 1587. It seems supported also by Barrowe's statement in the letter written immediately before his death, in April 1593, affirming that he had sustained "well neer six yeres imprisonment." Barrowe would have said "more than," had his incarceration begun in 1586.

The careful reader will query, probably, why Dr. Powicke, in his bibliography of Barrowe's writings, omits to give the full title of *A Collection of Certain Letters and Conferences*, on the ground that the title-page was damaged in the copy that he consulted. It is recorded under No. 170, in Dr. Dexter's bibliography of Congregational literature. One wonders, also, why he should have chosen to give the title and reprint the text of the *True Description . . . of the Visible Church* from the modified edition of 1641, rather than from the original of 1589. Dr. Powicke is so familiar with the original that he collates its readings on the margin of his text of 1641. The natural proceeding would have been to have printed the original in the place of honor. But these are not very serious blemishes on a conscientious and painstaking work.

WILLISTON WALKER.

A Critical Examination of Irish History, being a Replacement of the False by the True, from the Elizabethan Conquest to the Legislative Union of 1800. By T. DUNBAR INGRAM, LL.D. (London, New York and Bombay: Longmans, Green and Co.; Dublin: Hodges, Figgis and Co. 1900. Two vols., pp. vi, 354, 350.)

DR. INGRAM has produced not a history but a controversial pamphlet in two volumes, whose purpose is to prove the theses that England has

been the only benefactor of Ireland ; and that the Papacy and the Irish have been alone responsible for the sufferings of the country. His treatment is everywhere inadequate, particularly in the first volume, which covers a period of 184 years, while the second is devoted to but 16. There is nothing that can be regarded as an account of Ireland under Charles I., or of the Cromwellian conquest, or of the penal laws, which are discussed interminably without once being described. Even where a topic is fully treated, there is an almost complete absence of facts favorable to any but the author's view. He condemns the Irish for refusing to take the oath of allegiance in 1606, when this would have freed them from the consequences of the penal laws, but does not say that the penalties of the recusancy laws would not thus have been escaped ; he holds the Catholics accountable for the later penal laws because they declined in 1666 to sign a remonstrance, but he omits to mention that the Duke of Ormond stated that this remonstrance was purposely so drawn as to make it impossible for many Catholics to sign, though Mr. Osmund Airy long ago called his attention to this fact. He quotes Justice Keating's letter to James in behalf of English possessors of Irish land as evidence of the pernicious character of the Irish Act of Repeal in 1689, but fails to state that the letter was written before the bill was passed and while it was still uncertain what it would contain. These instances are examples of what is common throughout. The distortion of evidence is equally prevalent, especially in the author's inveterate habit of drawing unjustifiable inferences from the statements of all who are on the other side of the question.

Even more irritating are his sweeping generalizations : "There is no reason to doubt that if the Irish branch of the great Celtic family had been left to itself, it would gladly have accepted incorporation with the English people ;" "Perfect toleration and perfect equality existed in Ireland before the great rebellion of 1641 ;" "The Roman Catholics . . . were not actuated by any racial antipathies to the English or to the Anglo-Irish. Such a feeling never existed." This regrettable tendency to say more than the evidence will support is accompanied by an acrimonious temper : Mr. Lecky's assertions reveal "infinite folly, prejudice and ignorance ;" Macaulay displays "gross partiality" and "narrow bigotry ;" Burke's conduct in 1785 was "extremely dishonest ;" Flood was "thoroughly unscrupulous ;" George Ponsonby "insincerity personified ;" the leaders of the United Irishmen "murderous mountebanks ;" the Whig Club a "mischievous and contemptible body ;" Grattan uttered "crazy and pitiful nonsense," "seditious and inflammatory rant," and was inspired by "the mad rage of disappointment, measureless vanity, and profound ignorance of the constitution and laws of Ireland ;" while the last Irish Parliament was "the most worthless and incompetent assembly that ever misgoverned a country." Such unqualified condemnation refutes itself.

The book seems to have been written hastily and the author's materials are poorly digested, for the same statements and the narration of

the same events continually recur. Nevertheless, Dr. Ingram has studied the printed sources and even some manuscript sources, and occasionally his points are well-made. In minor matters he furnishes corrections to Lecky ; he is justified in laying stress upon the political side of the penal laws, and upon the fact that the Catholics in a measure provoked the passage of such laws ; it is true, too, that the Irish woolen industry was of little moment when it was suppressed by the English in 1699 ; that the Irish Parliament was venal and corrupt, and that the estates of absentees should have been taxed ; but even when right it is inevitable that he should not receive the credit of being so, since the reader is rendered suspicious by the violence of his tone, his evident bias, and his indiscriminate abuse of his opponents.

RALPH C. H. CATTERALL.

La Noblesse Française sous Richelieu. Par le Vicomte G. d'AVENEL.
(Paris : Armand Colin. 1901. Pp. 355.)

THE matter in this book is not new. In his elaborate and valuable work *Richelieu et la Monarchie Absolue*, published twenty years ago, the Vicomte G. d'Avenel treated of the condition of the nobility when Richelieu ruled over France. What was there said formed a part of three large volumes. The author has now printed by itself the portion which relates to the nobility, in one moderate-sized volume.

For the most part, the matter contained in the former work is reprinted word for word. Some additions have been made, of no great importance, and some slight changes made in the text. We notice that in giving the relative values of money, the author formerly estimated that a livre in the days of Richelieu had a purchasing power equal to six francs in our times. He now gives the equivalent value as five-fold. Such a multiplicity of circumstances have to be considered in estimating the relative values of money at different epochs, that at best one can only make a rough guess.

It was probably judicious to select the portion of the former work which treated of the nobility, that it might be presented in more convenient shape to the reading public. For the majority of readers, the French nobility is the most interesting of the institutions of the old régime. Certainly it was the most picturesque, though it was far from being the most useful. The Vicomte d'Avenel thinks that the forms of freer government still existed when Richelieu assumed power and should have been utilized by him, yet he finds little fault with the Cardinal's treatment of the French nobles. Indeed, his judgment upon the body of which he is a member has become more unfavorable, after twenty years of reflection. In 1881 he wrote : "History has been severe toward the nobility, sometimes even unjust." In the present volume he contents himself with saying that "History has been severe," without suggesting that it has been unjust. No follower of the Cardinal could have defended his policy toward the French nobility with more vigor than our